



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/927,851 | 08/10/2001 | Ross Elgart | RELGART.001A | 7081 |

20995 7590 07/15/2003

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

VEILLARD, JACQUES

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2175

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,851

Applicant(s)

ELGART, ROSS

Examiner

Jacques Veillard

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2175

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's communication filed on 8/10/2001.
2. Claims 1-35 are pending and presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-18, 19-25, and 32-35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "... the hardcopy document and a location of the hardcopy in a hardcopy document..." in lines 13 and 14. Correlation between "location" and "hardcopy". It is unclear how the hardcopies are incorporated in the system.

As per claims 2-18, they are also rejected on similar ground by dependency.

6. Claim 19 recites the limitation " hardcopy document records storing a least the location" in line 13. Correlation between "location" and "hardcopy". It is unclear how the hardcopies are incorporated in the system.

As per claims 20-25, they are also rejected on similar ground by dependency.

Art Unit: 2175

7. Claim 32 recites the limitation "... the hardcopy document and a location of the hardcopy document ..." in lines 24 and 25; same for claim 33 in line 7; and also for claim 34 in lines 19 and 20, and claim 35 in line 1 of page 24. Correlation between "location" and "hardcopy". It is unclear how the hardcopies are incorporated in the system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-23, 26-29, 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Link et al.(U.S.Pat. No. 6,366,923, hereinafter Link) in view of Cassorla et al.(U.S.Pat. No. 5,146,552, hereinafter Cassorla).

As per claim 1, Link teaches a system for conducting research on the Internet by accessing a pre-selected web side on a computer network (See Title and abstract lines 1-3). Similarly, the system taught by Link enabling a user to enter comments about an Internet link (See col.1, lines 61-67, and col.4, lines 11-13); storing the entered comments about the Internet link and a URL of the Internet link in an Internet link record in a database (See col.1, lines 56-60, and col.3, lines 42-57); associating the Internet link record with a category or an item (See Fig.4C

Art Unit: 2175

component 25); and making the Internet link record, the electronic file record, and the hardcopy document record accessible to other users that use the database (See col.1, lines 19-29), wherein the Internet link record, the electronic file record, and the hardcopy document record can be associated with a same category or a same item (See Fig.4B, and col.5, lines 18-22). Link does not explicitly teach the system for enabling the user to enter comments about an electronic file ; storing the entered comments about the electronic file and a file access path of the electronic file in an electronic file record in the database; associating the electronic file record with a category or an item; enabling the user to enter comments about a hardcopy document; storing the entered comments about the hardcopy document and a location of the hardcopy document in a hardcopy document record in the database; associating the hardcopy document record with a category or an item.

However, Cassorla in the same endeavor, teaches a method for associating annotation or note with electronic material documents(See Title and abstract) includes the feature for enabling the user to enter comments about an electronic file (See abstract lines 1-4, lines 17-23, col.2, lines 20-23); storing the entered comments about the electronic file and a file access path of the electronic file in an electronic file record in the database(See abstract lines 4-6, and col.2, lines 23-25, and lines 45-48); associating the electronic file record with a category or an item(See col.3, lines 19-35); enabling the user to enter comments about a hardcopy document (See col.1, lines 61-66); storing the entered comments about the hardcopy document and a location of the hardcopy document in a hardcopy document record in the database (See abstract lines 6-12, col.2,

Art Unit: 2175

lines 25-31, and lines 45-54); associating the hardcopy document record with a category or an item (See col.2, lines 35-41).

Link and Cassorla are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor: create notes or annotation in a document.

At the time of the Applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the annotation with electronically published document taught by Cassorla to modify the teachings of Link to include the electronic book and hardcopy book feature with the motivation for a user to add notes and output a hardcopy using the browser's command (See Link's col.6, lines 35-36).

As per claims 19, 29, 33, and 35, the claims have substantially the same limitations as claim 1. These limitations are already addressed in the rejection of claim 1. Therefore, they are rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given for claim 1 rejection above. In addition, Link teaches a category records, wherein a category can be a sub-category of another (See Fig.2, and col.3, lines 26-35).

As per claims 26, 32, and 34, the claims have substantially the same limitations as claim 1. These limitations are already addressed in the rejection of claim 1. Therefore, they are rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given for claim 1 rejection above. In addition, Link teaches the feature enabling a user to navigate to an Internet link and electronic file using a

Art Unit: 2175

web browser (See Link's Figs 4A-4F, and col.4, line 64 through col.6, line 33). Link achieves this limitation by providing a browser and a computer-implemented search program as a search engine wherein users have the capability of navigating back and forth to access information and find useful information pertinent to their interest.

As per claim 2, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, wherein enabling a user to enter comments about an Internet link comprises enabling the user to enter a summary in a description filed of the Internet link record (See Link's col.1, lines 63-66), and enabling the user to enter other comments in a notes field of the Internet link record (See Link's. Col.4, lines 11-13).

As per claim 3, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, wherein enabling a user to enter comments about an electronic file comprises enabling the user to enter a summary in a description filed of the electronic file record (See Cassorla's abstract lines 17-23, and col.2, lines 35-41), and enabling the user to enter other comments in a notes field of the electronic file record (See Cassorla's Fig.3, and col.6, lines 51-68).

As per claim 4, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, wherein enabling a user to enter comments about a hardcopy document

Art Unit: 2175

comprises enabling the user to enter a summary in a description filed of the hardcopy document record, and enabling the user to enter other comments in a notes field of the hardcopy document record(See Link's col.6, lines 25-31).

As per claim 5, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, wherein an item is associated with a category See link's Fig.2).

As per claim 7, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, wherein a category can be associated with another category (See Link's Fig.2).

As per claim 8, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, wherein an item can be associated with one or more categories (See Link's Fig.4A component 24 in conjunction with component 25).

As per claims 9-12, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, further comprising enabling the user to associate the Internet link record with another category or another item (See Link's Figs.4A-4C, component 24 in conjunction with component 25).

Art Unit: 2175

As per claim 16, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, further comprising generating a report of at least a portion of the Internet link records, electronic file records, and hardcopy document records stored in the database (See Link's col.5, lines 23-25).

As per claims 17 and 18, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, further comprising printing at least a portion of a web page identified by the stored URL of a Internet link record, and printing the stored entered comments of the Internet link record (See Link's col.3, lines 39-57, and col.6, lines 33-36).

As per claims 27 and 28, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, further comprising enabling the user or another user to navigate to the Internet link by issuing a command on the stored Internet link (See Link's Figs 4A-4F, and col.4, line 64 through col.6, line 33). Link achieves this limitation by providing a browser and a computer-implemented search program as a search engine wherein users have the capability of navigating back and forth to access information and find useful information pertinent to their interest.

As per claims 6, 13-15, and 20-23, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified teaches the claimed invention limitations, wherein enabling the user to designate categories,

Art Unit: 2175

Internet link, electronic file, and hardcopy document in the database as shared; making Internet link records, electronic file records, and hardcopy document records associated with the shared categories Internet link and hardcopy document accessible to other users that use the database; and making Internet link records, electronic file records, and hardcopy document records associated with the items that are associated with the shared categories accessible to other users that use the database (See Link's Figs 4A-4F, col.4, line 24 through col.6, line 65, and col.7, line 10 through col.8, line 28).

10. Claims 24,25,30, and 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Link (U.S.Pat No. 6,366,923) and Cassorla (U.S.Pat.No. 5,146,552) as applied to claims 19 and 29 above, and further in view of Salas et al.(U.S.Pat. No. 6,233,600, hereinafter Salas).

As per claims 24 and 30, the combination of Link and Cassorla as modified does not teach a system, wherein the database is a relational database.

However, Salas teaches a system for providing networked collaborative work environment includes servers and client workstations(See Title and abstract) includes the feature, wherein the database is a relational database (See col.3, lines 24-26, and col.4, lines 27-28).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the combination teachings of Link and Cassorla with the teachings of Salas to include a server database i.e., relational database or an object oriented

Art Unit: 2175

database with ODBC compliant which allows a user to access information from a database query as a result and allows application program to issue individual command to relational databases.

As per claims 25 and 31, the combination of Link, Cassorla, and Salas as modified, teaches the claimed invention limitation, wherein the database is an object-oriented database (See Salas's col.3, line 27 and col.4, line 29).

Other Prior Art Made of Record

11. Hughes et al. U. S. Pat. No. 54,892,908, discloses a method of extracting network information first receives an initial link address and retrieves a file associated with the link address,

Scherpbier U. S. Pat. No. 5,944,791, discloses a collaborative web browser wherein a pilot computer can then click on a hyperlink..., retrieve the appropriate web page,

Lee et al. U. S. Pat. No. 6,466,970, discloses a server system on a network such as World Wide Web ... and stores information about the content of one or more web pages served by a server on a network,

Shibata et al. U. S. Pat. No. 5,835,923, discloses a system relates to an information service based on publication s such as newspapers and magazines, wherein the publication page can be viewed ...,

Art Unit: 2175

Sutcliffe et al. U.S.Pat. No. 6,073,105, discloses an interactive personals online networked systems for integrating disparate databases over a computer network, and

Wlaschin et al. U. S. Pat. No. 5,729,730, discloses a method for storing, retrieving and distributing various kinds of data

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

13. **Any response to this action should be mail to:**

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communication intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal of draft communications, please label .

“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”)

Hand - delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA, Fourth Floor Lobby (Receptionist Telephone No. (703) 305-3900).

Art Unit: 2175

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques Veillard whose telephone number is (703) 305-7094. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 4: 30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-5403.

Charles Rones

CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Jacques Veillard

Jacques Veillard
Patent Examiner TC 2100

July 9, 2003